

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/829,021	INDERMUHLE ET AL.
	Examiner TIMOTHY G. KINGAN	Art Unit 1797

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) TIMOTHY G. KINGAN. (3) ____.
 (2) Chuan Gao. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 18 June 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,13 and 23.

Identification of prior art discussed: ____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney and examiner discussed an amendment to claim 23 that would put the application in condition for allowance. Applicant agreed to the amendment making claim 23 dependent on claim 1 or claim 13 and removing description of the microdevice.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Jill Warden/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797
--	---